

REMARKS

Claims 41-48 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 45-48 are added. Support for the new claims is provided at least in paragraphs [0148] - [0149] of the specification. No new matter is added. A Request for Continued Examination is attached. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 41-44 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Shigemura (U.S. Patent No. 6,667,795). Applicants respectfully traverses the rejection:

Shigemura fails to disclose a plurality of ejection heads having all of the features positively recited in claims 41-44.

In the Response to Arguments section, the Office Action asserts that Fig. 16 of Shigemura discloses a plurality of first, second and third nozzles in a same line. The Office Action identifies the "same line" in Fig. 16 on page 3 of the Office Action. For the following two reasons, the interpretation of Shigemura is incorrect in the Office Action.

First, the "same line" identified by the Examiner is oriented in the head scan direction, and thus is not perpendicular to the head scan direction¹, as recited in claims 41-44. See, for example, the Office Action on page 2, which admits that the "center line of nozzles" identified on Fig. 16 is perpendicular to the head scan direction. The "same line" identified in Office Action Fig. 16 is perpendicular to the "center line of nozzles," is thus not perpendicular to the head scan direction, as recited in claims 41-44.

Second, the nozzles arranged in the "same line" identified in Office Action Fig. 16 include only one first nozzle, only one second nozzle and only one third nozzle, as shown in

¹ The direction perpendicular to the head scan direction is shown in the drawings of the present application as the head line-free direction Y (see, e.g., Fig. 1 and paragraph [0125] of the specification).

Fig. 16, and not a plurality of either first, second or third nozzles, as recited in the claims 41-44.

For at least these reasons, Shigemura cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combinations of all of the features positively recited in independent claims 41-44.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 41-45 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Shigemura are respectfully requested.

Added claims 45-48 should be allowed based on the dependence of each of these claims from one of independent claims 41-44, as well as on the additional features recited in each of these claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 41-48 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Robert M. Jackson
Registration No. 46,796

JAO:RMJ/ccs

Attachment:

Request for Continued Examination

Date: October 26, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--